

## REMARKS

The applicants have studied the Office Action dated July 24, 2007. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to correct the informalities noted in paragraphs 1-3 of the Action and related to 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adams, US Patent Number 6, 594,366. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites:

“a plug-in detection circuit for determining a type of an audio output device coupled to an I/O jack and outputting the determined type of the audio output device to the stereo/mono control unit;

wherein the stereo/mono control unit receives an audio mux input identifying a type of a signal that the codec received from the audio mux, and the stereo/mono control unit provides a control output to the codec based on the determined type of the audio output device and the identified type of the signal.”

The reference cited by the Examiner does not fairly teach or suggest “stereo/mono control unit that provides a control output to a codec based on the determined type of the audio output device and the identified type of the signal.”

In the Adams reference, sensor 210 is configured to detect the presence of two different types of plugs (a first type of plug for a cell phone 106 and a second type of plug for a stereo headset 108. (*See col. 3, lines 62-64*) For example, sensor 210 includes “circuits to detect the presence of one or more types of 2.5 mm plugs.” The Adams system uses a switching unit 203 “to switch between AM/FM radio 202, the cell phone 200 output and input functionality.” The Adams system also uses a microphone switch 262 “to switch the microphone 128 on or off.” (*See col. 3, lines 41-45 and col. 3, line 62 to col. 4, line 45 of the Adams reference*).

However, claim 1 recites “a stereo/mono control unit receives an audio mux input identifying a type of a signal that the codec received from the audio mux, and the stereo/mono control unit provides a control output to the codec based on the determined type of the audio output device and the identified type of the signal.” The Adams reference does not fairly teach or disclose identifying a type of a signal that the codec received from the

audio mux, and providing a control output to a codec based on the determined type of the audio output device and the identified type of the signal, as recited in the claim 1.

Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Adams does not appear to disclose a stereo/mono control unit coupled to a codec as claimed. For example, controller 202, switch 262, and cell phone controller 200 do not fairly teach or suggest the stereo/mono control unit as claimed. Moreover, Adam does not appear to fairly teach or suggest a stereo/mono control unit that receives an audio mux input identifying a type of a signal that the codec received from the audio mux.

Furthermore, it does not appear that any of the blocks ((e.g., 201, 203, 210) of Adams provides any signals, for that matter, to a codec. It is noted that a codec is neither shown in the Figures of Adams, nor is it described in the specification of Adams. If this rejection is maintained, perhaps, the Examiner can point out a specific portion of Adams that teaches identifying a type of signal and “providing a control output to a codec based on the determined type of audio output device and the identified type of signal,” as claimed.

Claims 2-9 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claims 2-9 are patentable as written over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as those provided above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-9 be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 12, Adams fails to teach or suggest, “determining a type of the received audio signals; and providing a control output to disable or enable a first channel in a receive audio processing path based on the type of the audio output device and the type of the received audio signals,” as claimed in claim 12.

Claim 12 recites claim limitations that are similar to the limitations set forth in claim 1. In particular, claim 12 recites “determining a type of the received audio signals,” which as argued previously is not fairly taught or suggested by Adams. Moreover, claim 12 recites “providing a control output to disable or enable a first channel in a receive audio processing path based on the type of the audio output device and the type of the received audio signals,” which as argued previously is not fairly taught or suggested by Adams. As such, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentably distinct from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 1.

Claims 13-21 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12. As such, Applicants submit that claims 13-21 are patentable as written over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as those provided above in connection with claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12-21 be withdrawn.

Thus, claim 1-9 and 12-21 distinguish over the art of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-9 and 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application and all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 10, 2007  
QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

By: /Eric Ho/  
Eric Ho  
Registration No. 39,711  
(858) 658-2752